

NEW JERSEY MILITIA NEWSLETTER

Volume XVI, Issue No. 3

September 2010

All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

-- Article 1, Section 1, New Jersey State Constitution

The Origins of Political Correctness

By Bill Lind

Political Correctness is cultural Marxism. It is Marxism translated from economic into cultural terms. If we compare the basic tenets of Political Correctness with classical Marxism the parallels are very obvious.

First of all, both are totalitarian ideologies. The totalitarian nature of Political Correctness is revealed nowhere more clearly than on college campuses, many of which are small ivy covered North Koreas, where the student or faculty member who dares to cross any of the lines set up by the gender feminist or the homosexual-rights activists, or the local black or Hispanic group, or any of the other sainted "victims" groups that PC revolves around, quickly find themselves in trouble. Within the small legal system of the college, they face formal charges – some star-chamber proceeding – and punishment. That is a little look into the future that Political Correctness intends for the nation as a whole.

Second, the cultural Marxism of Political Correctness, like economic Marxism, has a single explanation of history. Economic Marxism says that all of history is determined by ownership of means of production. Cultural Marxism, or Political Correctness, says that all history is determined by power, by which groups defined in terms of race, sex, etc., have power over which other groups. Nothing else matters. Everything in the past is about that one thing.

Third, just as in classical economic Marxism certain groups, i.e. workers and peasants, are a priori good, and other groups, i.e., the bourgeoisie and capital owners, are

evil. In the cultural Marxism of Political Correctness certain groups are good – feminist women, (only feminist women, non-feminist women are deemed not to exist) blacks, Hispanics, homosexuals. These groups are determined to be "victims," and therefore automatically good regardless of what any of them do. Similarly, white males are determined automatically to be evil, thereby becoming the equivalent of the bourgeoisie in economic Marxism.

Fourth, both economic and cultural Marxism rely on expropriation. When the classical Marxists, the communists, took over Russia, they expropriated the bourgeoisie, they took away their property. Similarly, when the cultural Marxists take over a university, they expropriate through things like quotas for admissions. When a white student with superior qualifications is denied admittance in favor of a black or Hispanic who isn't as well qualified, the white student is expropriated. And indeed, affirmative action is a system of expropriation. White owned companies don't get a contract because the contract is reserved for a company owned by, say, Hispanics or women. So expropriation is a principle tool for both forms of Marxism.

And finally, both have a method of analysis that automatically gives the answers they want. For the classical Marxist, it's Marxist economics. For the cultural Marxist, it's deconstruction.

Deconstruction essentially takes any text, removes all meaning from it and re-inserts any meaning desired. So we find, for example, that all of Shakespeare is about the suppression of women, or the Bible is really about race and gender. All of these texts simply become grist for the mill, which proves that "all history is about which groups have

power over which other groups." So the parallels are very evident between the classical Marxism of the Soviet Union and the cultural Marxism that we see today as Political Correctness.

Political Correctness has a history that goes back to World War I, when Marxist theorists said the working class throughout Europe would rise up and overthrow their bourgeois governments because the workers had more in common with each other across the national boundaries than they had in common with the bourgeoisie and the ruling class in their own country. Well, 1914 came and it didn't happen. Throughout Europe, workers rallied to their flag and happily marched off to fight each other. So something was wrong.

Marxists knew it couldn't be their theory, so the theorists Antonio Gramsci in Italy and Georg Lukacs in Hungary said the workers will never see their true class interests, as defined by Marxism, until they are freed from Western culture, and particularly from the Christian religion. Lukacs theorized that the great obstacle to the creation of a Marxist paradise was Western civilization itself.

In 1923 a wealthy German Marxist convert, Felix Weil, endowed an institute associated with Frankfurt University, originally to be known as the Institute for Marxism. But the last thing Political Correctness wants is for people to figure out it's a form of Marxism. So instead it was named the Institute for Social Research, in order to translate Marxism from economic into cultural terms, that is, Political Correctness as we know it today.

Weil is very clear about his goals. In 1971 he wrote author Martin Jay, "I wanted the institute to become known, perhaps famous, due to its

contributions to Marxism." The first director of the Institute, Carl Grunberg, concluded his opening address, according to Jay, "by clearly stating his personal allegiance to Marxism as a scientific methodology."

But the people who create and form the Frankfurt School [as the ISR became known] are renegade Marxists. They're effectively run out of the party. Moscow looks at what they are doing and says, "Hey, this isn't us, and we're not going to bless this."

Another Institute director Max Horkheimer's initial heresy is that he is very interested in Freud, and the key to transitioning Marxism from economic into cultural terms is essentially that he combined it with Freudism. Martin Jay writes – and Jay is very sympathetic to the Frankfurt School – "in the years after 1930 its primary interests lay in its cultural superstructure. Indeed the traditional Marxist formula regarding the relationship between the two was brought into question by Critical Theory."

The stuff we've been hearing about this morning – the radical feminism, the women's studies departments, the gay studies departments, the black studies departments – all these things are branches of Critical Theory. What the Frankfurt School essentially does is draw on both Marx and Freud to create this Critical Theory. The term is ingenious because you're tempted to ask, "What is the theory?" The theory is to criticize. The theory is that the way to bring down Western culture and the capitalist order is not to lay down an alternative. They explicitly refuse to do that. They say it can't be done, that we can't imagine what a free society would look like (their definition of a free society). As long as we're living under repression – the repression of a capitalistic economic order which creates (in their theory) the Freudian condition, the conditions that Freud describes in individuals of repression – we can't even imagine it. Critical Theory calls for the most destructive criticism possible, in every possible way, designed to bring the current order down. And, of course, when we hear from the feminists that the whole of society is just out to get women and so on, that kind of criticism is a derivative of Critical Theory. It is all coming from the 1930s, not the 1960s.

How does all of this stuff flood into our universities, and indeed into our lives today? The members of the

Frankfurt School are Marxist, they are also, to a man, Jewish. In 1933 the Nazis came to power in Germany, and not surprisingly they shut down the Institute for Social Research. And its members fled. They fled to New York City, and the Institute was reestablished there in 1933 with help from Columbia University. And the members of the Institute, gradually shift their focus from Critical Theory about German society, to Critical Theory directed toward American society....

In conclusion, America today is in the throes of the greatest and direst transformation in its history. We are becoming an ideological state, a country with an official state ideology enforced by the power of the state. In "hate crimes" we now have people serving jail sentences for political thoughts. And the Congress is now moving to expand that category ever further. Affirmative action is part of it. The terror against anyone who dissents from Political Correctness on campus is part of it. It's exactly what we have seen happen in Russia, in Germany, in Italy, in China, and now it's coming here. And we don't recognize it because we call it Political Correctness and laugh it off. My message today is that it's not funny, it's here, it's growing and it will eventually destroy, as it seeks to destroy, everything that we have ever defined as our freedom and our culture.

-- Accuracy in Academia, Feb. 5, 2000

"Cultural Marxism: The Corruption of America"

The documentary "Cultural Marxism: The Corruption of America," produced by James Jaeger, shows how a group of Marxist theoreticians, calling themselves The Frankfurt School, plotted the corruption and overthrow of non-Communist nations by systematically undermining their cultures. Called Cultural Marxism, its goal is the use of art, music, education, and media to condition people to accept the essential elements of Marxism without identifying them as such. After a few generations of this conditioning, Marxism becomes the new reality without a violent revolution and even without awareness that a revolution has occurred. If you want to know how the nations of the world became increasingly Marxist in form, if not in name, here is the strategy

The film's opening statement by Pat Buchanan prepares the viewer for what is to follow: "The United States

has undergone a cultural, moral, and religious revolution. ... We are two countries now. We are two countries morally, culturally, socially, and theologically. Cultural wars do not lend themselves to peaceful co-existence. One side prevails, or the other prevails. The truth is that, while we won the Cold War with political and economic Communism, we lost the war with cultural Marxism, which now is dominant. Those of us who are traditionalists, we are the counterculture."

Includes testimony from G. Edward Griffin, Ron Paul, Pat Buchanan, Edwin Vieira, and Ted Baehr. -- DVD 98 mins.

L.A. to use heat-beam ray in jail

LOS ANGELES – A device designed to control unruly inmates by blasting them with a beam of intense energy that causes a burning sensation is drawing heat from civil rights groups who fear it could cause serious injury and is "tantamount to torture."

The mechanism, known as an "Assault Intervention Device," sends highly focused beams of energy at people and makes them feel as though they are burning. The L.A. County sheriff plans to install the device by Labor Day, making it the first time the technology has been deployed in such a capacity.

The 4-foot-tall weapon, which looks like a cross between a robot and a satellite radar, will be mounted on the ceiling and can swivel.

It is remotely controlled by an operator in a separate room who lines up targets with a joystick.

The American Civil Liberties Union noted that early military versions resulted in five airmen suffering lasting burns. It requested a meeting with Sheriff Baca, who declined the invitation.

The sheriff said it would be installed in the dorm of a jail in north L.A. County. It is far less powerful than the military version and has various safeguards in place, including a three-second limit to each beam of heat.

The natural response when blasted — to leap out the way — would be helpful in bringing difficult inmates under control and quelling riots, the sheriff said.

But the sheriff was creating a dangerous environment with "a weapon that can cause serious injury that is being put into a place where there is a

In the beginning of change the patriot is a scarce man, brave, hated and scorned. When his cause succeeds, however, the timid join him, for then it costs nothing to be a patriot. – Mark Twain

long history of abuse of prisoners," ACLU attorney Peter Eliasberg said.

Cmdr. Bob Osborne, who oversees technology for the sheriff's department, said the device would be a more humane way of dealing with jail disturbances. Unlike hitting inmates with batons or deploying tear gas, a shot from the beam has no aftereffects, he said.

The device was made by Raytheon Missile Systems, and its \$750,000 cost was paid for by a Department of Justice grant.

— AP, August 27, 2010

What is Moderate Islam?

Don't Gloss Over the Violent Texts

By Tawfik Hamid

In regards to Islam, the words "moderate" and "radical" are relative terms. Without defining them it is virtually impossible to defeat the latter or support the former.

Radical Islam is not limited to the act of terrorism; it also includes the embrace of teachings within the religion that promote hatred and ultimately breed terrorism. Those who limit the definition of radical Islam to terrorism are ignoring – and indirectly approving of – the Shariah teachings that permit killing apostates, violence against women and gays, and anti-Semitism.

Moderate Islam should be defined as a form of Islam that rejects these violent and discriminatory edicts. Furthermore, it must provide a strong theological refutation for the mainstream Islamic teaching that the Muslim *umma* (nation) must declare wars against non-Muslim nations, spreading the religion and giving non-Muslims the following options: convert, pay a humiliating tax, or be killed. This violent concept fuels jihadists who take the teaching literally and accept responsibility for applying it to the modern world.

Moderate Islam must not be passive. It needs to actively reinterpret the violent parts of the religious text rather than simply cherry-picking the peaceful ones. Ignoring, rather than confronting or contextualizing, the violent texts leaves young Muslims vulnerable to such teaching at a later stage in their lives.

Finally, moderate Islam must powerfully reject the barbaric practices of jihadists. Ideally, this would mean Muslims demonstrating en masse all over the world against the violence carried out in the name of their religion.

Moderate Islam must be honest enough to admit that Islam has been used in a violent manner at several stages in history to seek

domination over others. Insisting that all acts in Islamic history and all current Shariah teachings are peaceful is a form of deception that makes things worse by failing to acknowledge the existence of the problem.

Mr. Hmid, a former member of the Islamic radical group Jamma Islamiya, is an Islamic reformer and a senior fellow at the Potomac Institute.

-- Wall St. Journal, September 1, 2010

This mosque is about more than a building

By Janet Allen

Regarding Russell Simmons's "A Challenge for WTC Mosque Opponents" (op-ed Aug. 27), I don't know any Americans who fear Islam as a religious belief, or who argue against the constitutionally protected right to worship as one chooses. Rather it is Islam as a legal, political and social system that people fear, and their emotions are based on facts. While we hear the "Islam means peace," what we see is Shariah law, brutal restrictions of human rights, barbaric punishments for nonviolent infractions, intolerance of any religion other than Islam, the holy duty to assimilate or destroy nonbelievers, jihad and deadly terrorist acts committed world-wide. Moderate American Muslims who wish to build mosques, whether in Manhattan or California, would encounter less opposition if their imams assured their communities that nothing would be preached that goes against our national values of freedom, equality, the separation of church and state and the rule of American law.

-- Wall St. Journal, September 2, 2010

Quote of the week

"Let's just make one thing clear. A small church, in a small town, down a back road, burning copies of its own books, on its own property, is not responsible for the violent actions anyone may take in retaliation to our protest." -- From the website of Dove World Outreach Center, whose pastor, Terry Jones, author of *Islam is of the Devil*, planned to burn copies of the Koran on the anniversary of 9/11

"The Age of American Unreason"

I remember a conversation my friend and colleague Bill Moyers had with journalist and author Susan Jacoby on "Bill Moyers Journal" in 2008, just after the publication of her book, "The Age of American Unreason."

She cited a 2006 National Geographic-Roper Survey: "Only 23 percent of college-educated young

people could find Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Iran and Israel, four countries of ultimate importance to American policy on the map - a map, by the way, that had the countries lettered on it. So in other words, it wasn't a blank map, [which] meant they didn't really know where the Middle East was either ... If only 23 percent of people with some college can find those countries on a map that is nothing to be bragging about. And that has to have something to do with why, as a country, we have such shallow political discussions."

When Moyers spoke with Susan Jacoby about "the ignorance and erosion of historical memory that makes serious deceptions possible and plausible," she cited as an example that, "If we don't know what our Constitution says about the separation of powers then it certainly affects the way we decide all kinds of public issues."

According to a survey conducted last year by The American Revolution Center, a nonpartisan, educational group, more than half of American adults "mistakenly believe the Constitution established a government of direct democracy, rather than a democratic republic," a third don't know that the right to trial by jury is guaranteed by the Bill of Rights and "many more Americans remember that Michael Jackson sang 'Beat It' than know that the Bill of Rights is part of the Constitution." (Sixty percent knew that reality TV's Jon and Kate Gosselin had eight kids, but more than a third did not know that the American Revolution took place in the 18th century.)

Years ago, I attended a rally protesting government cuts in funding for education and the arts. One of the speakers suggested that we boomers may be the first generation to teach the next generation less than we know. That often willful ignorance may turn out to be our final, fatal mistake, the greatest American tragedy of all.

-- From a Truthout op-ed by Michael Winship, September 1, 2010

Ed.: Mr. Winship, isn't the failure of government education the cause of our ignorance?

Our failing public schools

By Paul R. Hollrah

In an August 11, 2010 article for Townhall.com, titled "The Left's Special-Interest Human Shields," Michelle Malkin gives us a clue as to why our public education system is the greatest failure among all our public institutions. Clearly, what has always been an important, necessary, and highly respected profession, has been

transformed into just another cesspool of leftist union activism, just another mindless, lemming-like subsidiary of the Democratic Party.

Malkin says, "My opposition to the so-called 'Edujobs' bill stems not from meanness but from compassion for millions of dues-paying school employees being used as special-interest human shields."

Malkin quotes the 2009 Labor Union Report; the National Education Association (NEA) "raked in a whopping \$355,334,165 in 'dues and agency fees'." The NEA poured \$50 million into "political activities and lobbying" for exclusively left-wing and partisan Democratic causes and candidates.

What does the NEA see as their top priority? NEA top lawyer, Bob Chanin, speaking at the NEA annual meeting in July said, "Despite what some among us would like to believe, it is not because of our creative ideas. It is not because of the merit of our positions. It is not because we care about children, and it is not because we have a vision of a great public school for every child. NEA and its affiliates are effective advocates because we have power. And we have power because there are more than 3.2 million people who are willing to pay us hundreds of millions of dollars in dues each year, because they believe that we are the unions that can most effectively represent them as education employees. . . .

"This is not to say that the concern of NEA and its affiliates with closing achievement gaps, reducing dropout rates, improving teacher quality and the like are unimportant or inappropriate. To the contrary. These are the goals that guide the work we do. But they need not and must not be achieved at the expense of due process, employee rights, and collective bargaining. That simply is too high a price to pay."

Talk about upside-down priorities. As Barack Obama's personal hero, Saul Alinsky, has said, teacher organizers must commit to a "singleness of purpose." Not serving the needs of parents and children, but serving the "ability to build a (political) power base."

Yet, in spite of the fact we as a nation spend more on public education per pupil than any other industrialized nation, among high school students in the 30 richest nations, U.S. students rank 17th in the sciences and 24th in mathematics.

-- <http://nationalwriterssyndicate.com>

"The Coming Famine"

One billion people, a sixth of the world's population, is undernourished or starving.

But we also have another worry, says Julian Cribb, a veteran science journalist from Australia, "The era of cheap, abundant food is over."

He presents evidence that we have passed the peaks for oil, water, fertilizer and land, and that we will soon have passed it for food, as wealthy nations experience shortages and rising prices, and poorer ones starve.

Cribb's "The Coming Famine" builds an argument that global chaos — a tidal wave of people fleeing their own countries for wherever they can find food — is all but guaranteed.

It's clear that there simply isn't enough of the Euro-American way of life to go around.

And while there is a sky-is-falling tone to his thesis — if it doesn't make you restock your survivalist shelter with another hundred pounds of rice and beans — the book does offer sensible ways to help alleviate the "global feeding frenzy."

Most important are population growth and overconsumption. A projected 33 percent growth in population in the next 20 years, combined with increased consumption of meat as the global middle class grows larger, means that food production must grow by at least 50 percent.

The grain fed to American animals alone is enough to feed those billion hungry people. But grain stockpiles shrank in the last decade, and the amount of available water for each human is plummeting. Yet to produce more food and meat we need much more water.

We also need as much as "two more North Americas" to produce the fodder needed. Yet existing land is being degraded by a variety of factors.

Mr. Cribb would have society mandate food and waste composting; eliminate subsidies to the biggest agriculture companies; and finance research for new technology.

He proposes subsidizing small farms for their stewardship of the earth, and paying them fairer prices; taxing food to reflect its true costs to the environment; regulating practices that counter sustainability and rewarding those that promote it; and educating the public about the true costs of food.

Individuals can make helpful changes. Dietary change is primary, and can be as simple as eating a salad instead of a cheeseburger and an

apple instead of a bag of chips. Waste less food. Compost. Garden, even if you live in a city. Choose sustainable food, including fish.

"Even if North Americans and Europeans halved their meat and dairy consumption," Mr. Cribb writes, "the saving could be completely swamped by the demand from six hundred million newly affluent Indian and Chinese."

Finding a sustainable farming system is "perhaps the greatest challenge ever faced in the ten thousand years since agriculture began," he writes. If the challenge is not met, we're going to be reading scarier books than this one.

-- New York Times Aug. 24, 2010

Arizona fights back over U.N. Human Rights Report

By Ben Jonson

Arizona is fighting back against the Obama administration's decision to haul the state before the United Nations Human Rights Council. Governor Jan Brewer penned a letter to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton Friday expressing her "concern and indignation" at the administration's report to the UN, which cited a federal lawsuit against Arizona's immigration bill as part of its efforts to fight human rights violations.

"Apparently, the federal government is trying to make an international human rights case out of S.B. 1070 on the heels of already filing a federal court case against the State of Arizona," Brewer wrote.

She rightly noted the Orwellian aspect of a sitting president appealing to a world government to quash a popular state law. "The idea of our own American government submitting the duly enacted laws of a State of the United States to 'review' by the United Nations is internationalism run amok and unconstitutional," she wrote. "I again respectfully request that you amend the Report to remove Paragraph 95 relating to the State of Arizona and S.B. 1070. If you choose not to do so, the State of Arizona will monitor the proceedings and assert any rights it has in this process. Be assured that the State of Arizona will fight any attempt by the U.S. Department of State and the United Nations to interfere with the duly enacted laws of the State of Arizona in accordance with the U.S. Constitution."

Her letter pins the blame for the increased deaths of illegal aliens where it belongs: squarely on the shoulders of Barack Obama and his Open Borders allies.

The previous administration built a border fence securing the border

near San Diego, California, eliminating that as a viable port of entry. Brewer noted Obama's "failure to secure the entire border" and his decision "not to enforce major portions of our federal immigration laws" has encouraged alien traffickers to enter through the desert, leading to at least 170 dead illegals along the Arizona border so far this year.

The letter challenged Hillary to compare human rights conditions in Arizona with those in member nations of the UN Human Rights Council "and publish that comparison."

The only thing missing in her gutsy letter is mention of the human rights violations American citizens face because of Obama's de facto amnesty program, such as paramilitary clashes, drug trafficking, murders, increased gang activity, rampant kidnappings, sexual assaults, crime, welfare use, home invasions, overcrowded schools, hospital closures caused by soaring medical costs, job losses, bulging prison detentions, bilingual status, property damage, environmental degradation, and overburdened infrastructure.

Obama turns a blind eye to American suffering in hopes of granting amnesty to millions of poorly educated welfare recipients (or, as they're typically known, Democratic voters).

He continues to legally harass Sheriff Joe Arpaio. On Thursday, U.S. AG Eric Holder gave a second ultimatum for Arpaio to participate in his own star chamber proceedings.

Brewer is standing up for her state and the whole country — and not merely on the immigration issue. The remainder of Obama's report to the UN Human Rights Council establishes new categories of "rights" for the UN to enforce, including the "right" to gay "marriage" and military service, ObamaCare, card-check union registration, taxpayer-funded daycare, bilingual education, race-based voting schemes, and Affirmative Action. Three foreign nations will then draw up a plan for the United States to follow, in order to implement these "rights" — and check up on our progress four years from now. The UN body reserves the right to "decide on the measures it would need to take in case of persistent non-cooperation."

The Left has increasingly used foreign law to promote its agenda. In this report, he appealed for international socialists to help foist his agenda on the American people. Glenn Beck's "Restoring Honor" rally and Brewer's letter show he will not succeed without a fight. I'm gratified if my reporting played some small role in this rebellion.

-- <http://floydreports.com> Aug. 30, 2010

Invasive UN Treaty in 600 American Cities

By Cassandra Anderson

There are over 600 US cities that are members of ICLEI, the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives, now known as Local Governments for Sustainability. ICLEI institutes the UN Convention on Biological Diversity treaty that was withdrawn from a vote on the Senate floor in 1994, so the treaty, designed for UN control, is being implemented in cities.

Here's the description of the program from ICLEI's own website: *International Goals*

Our programs, and projects promote participatory, long-term, strategic planning process that address local sustainability while protecting global common goods. This approach links local action to internationally agreed-upon goals and targets such as: Agenda 21 the Rio Conventions: The UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and The UN Convention on Biological Diversity.

ICLEI has many carbon reduction schemes that seem harmless, but ICLEI uses small steps to accomplish its goals. Last week Colorado Gubernatorial candidate Dan Maes warned that ICLEI is a UN plot for control at a rally in Denver, which is an ICLEI city. It made international headlines and some people scoffed because Maes used the bicycling program as an example. ICLEI does have programs to limit transportation.

Maes' opponent is John Hickenlooper, the Mayor of Denver and he is a 'Cool Mayor', which is a facet of an ICLEI program used to execute CO2 reduction. CO2 reduction encourages depopulation.

Watch this short YouTube video from a 350.org Climate Change rally in Denver less than a year ago where NOAA scientist advocates "doing whatever we can to reduce population". The crowd responded by cheering! Hickenlooper was a key speaker at this event.

ICLEI is the UN accredited NGO (non-governmental organization) to represent Local Authorities. ICLEI receives funding from the United Nations, the Rockefeller Foundation, US governmental agencies like the EPA, cities, international entities and other undisclosed partners.

Find out more about the UN Convention on Biological Diversity

treaty described in this YouTube video, "Agenda 21 for Dummies."

Watch this YouTube video featuring G. Edward Griffin, author of 'The Fearful Master, a Second Look at the United Nations', exposing the true nature of the UN and the people behind its political policies.

Discover the truth about man-made global warming/ climate change that is based in manipulated data from the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (UN IPCC) and other governmental sources with political agendas. The Denver Post carried the story about Dan Maes' exposure of ICLEI last week, just before the Colorado primaries to be held on Tuesday August 10th. It remains to be seen whether major publications like SFGate and the UK Guardian that ran the story last week will follow up on this information.

Please visit www.FreedomAdvocates.org for more information about ICLEI and how to stop it and remove ICLEI from your city.

* * * Internet comment on this post: Jacqueline 2010-08-09 09:06

Would you say that we are surrounded by traitors? Whose side is the military on?

Traitors lose heads. Daddy O gave the UN control of our oceans and lakes....I wonder why? Would you say that UN Troops can surround us and have access to this country from all sides including inland waterways? Daddy O does not listen to the lowly class of people only to the elites....the Bilderberg Members who decide the what and who agenda and the other secret societies that implement the agenda. Are we, the American People going to sit back and watch the devil take over without a fight to stop it? The elitists are greedy, discompassionate, selfish gloats that are ruled by the devil. Do they really think that they can take their billions to hell with them? Any courageous God fearing people left out there?

-- www.morphcity.com, Aug. 9, 2010

Ed.: Maes, a Tea Party-backed candidate, defeated the GOP candidate in the Colorado gubernatorial primary.

U.S. reverses stance on arms control treaty

The U.S. said it would back launching talks on a treaty to regulate arms sales as long as the talks operated by consensus, a stance critics said gave every nation a veto.

The decision overturns the position of the Bush administration, which had opposed such a treaty on the grounds that national controls were better.

"Consensus is needed to ensure the widest possible support for the Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty and to avoid loopholes that can be exploited by those wishing to export arms irresponsibly," Sec. of State Hillary Clinton said.

Some groups criticized the U.S. insistence that decisions on the treaty be unanimous.

Amnesty International and Oxfam International said in a joint statement that decisions made by consensus "could fatally weaken a final deal."

The proposed treaty would tighten regulation of, and set international standards for, the import, export and transfer of conventional weapons.

Nations would be legally obliged to assess each export against criteria agreed under the treaty. Governments would have to authorize transfers in writing and in advance.

Last year, the United States accounted for more than two-thirds of some \$55.2 billion in global arms transfer deals.

Arms exporters China, Russia and Israel abstained last year in a U.N. vote on the issue.

The proposed treaty is opposed by conservative think tanks like the Heritage Foundation, which said that it would not restrict the access of "dictators and terrorists" to arms but would be used to reduce the ability of democracies such as Israel to defend their people.

The National Rifle Association has also opposed the treaty.

A resolution before the U.N. General Assembly calls for preparatory meetings in 2010 and 2011 for a conference to negotiate a treaty in 2012. — Reuters, Oct. 14, 2009

Commentary: The Obama administration has taken its first major step in a plan to ban all firearms in the United States.

Tea Parties vs. Slumber Parties

By Coco

The latest response to the Tea Party and militia movements in our liberal, urban enclaves are certain get-togethers called "Slumber Parties."

Slumber Parties are the latest craze among the chic, upscale, college-educated Obama supporters since they can no longer protest the Iraq War.

While they profess to be having a blast, putting on "fun" events based on fond childhood memories, these "parties" look more like just another desperate attempt to make themselves forget that they are sheep-like, depressed idiots, devoid of talent or any useful traits. Perhaps the last time they were truly happy was as children, and so trying to relive that past, all the while ruining childhood for the rest of us by replacing our golden memories with visions of their nasty adult selves cavorting like simpletons.

Some say the Slumber Parties, attended mostly by recent college graduates, are simply a reaction to the trauma of leaving the nest for the big city only to find a world that doesn't say, "You're the greatest thing we've ever seen!"

The Sovereign sent an undercover reporter to a recent liberal Slumber Party and was surprised to hear that many of the hipsters were on welfare. Since there are no jobs, hipsters are reduced to buying organic produce with food stamps. They claim that the "jobs will come back" when the Marxists assume full power.

-- The Sovereign, P.O. Box 418, NYC 10116. \$3 for sample copy

SPLC lambastes "sovereign citizens"

...[There is a] sprawling subculture of "sovereign citizens" in America: hundreds of thousands of far-right extremists who believe that they — not judges, juries, law enforcement or elected officials — get to decide which laws to obey and which to ignore, and who don't think they should

have to pay taxes. While law enforcement officers may disagree on how to deal with or even label this extremist subculture, one thing is certain: it's trouble. The sovereign movement is growing fast, and its partisans are clogging up the courts with their indecipherable filings. When cornered, many of them lash out in rage, frustration and, in the most extreme cases, acts of deadly violence.

It is difficult to say precisely how many sovereigns there are in the United States today, in part because there is no central leadership and no organized group that members can join — instead, there are a variety of local leaders with individualized takes on sovereign citizen ideology and techniques. Those who are attracted to this bizarre subculture typically attend a seminar or two, or visit one of the thousands of websites and online videos on the subject, and then simply choose how to act on what they've learned. Some start by testing sovereign ideology with small offenses such as driving without a license, while others proceed directly to taking on the IRS as tax protesters.

In the mid-1990s, the IRS estimated that there were approximately 250,000 such tax protesters in the U.S., not all of whom were full-blown sovereign ideologues. Since the late 1990s, an abundance of evidence suggests that the sovereign citizen movement's growth has been explosive, although there have been no more recent IRS estimates because Congress in 1998 prohibited the agency from tracking or labeling those who file frivolous arguments in lieu of paying their taxes. But a conservative estimate of the number of all kinds of tax protesters today would be about 500,000....

Ed.: this Aug. 14, 2010 Southern Poverty Law Center Report by Ms. J.J. MacNab links the killing of two West Memphis, Ark., police officers on May 20 during a "routine traffic stop" to the sovereign citizen movement. Jerry Kane, the father of the alleged 16 year old shooter, reportedly did not have a driver's license.

NJM, P.O. Box 10176, Trenton New Jersey 08650

ISSN 1523-4657

www.njmilitia.org

info@njmilitia.org

walnor@keepandbeararms.com

Middlesex County, Art (732) 607-0833

Morris County, Bill (973) 361-3241

Johnson County, TX, Earl (817) 783-2375

Wake County, NC, Dave (919) 521-4147

Newsletter Subscription - Donation \$10.00

Cash or Blank Money Order Only

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State ____ Zip _____